

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/669,576	Applicant(s) HOCHRAINER ET AL.	
	Examiner CLINTON OSTRUP	Art Unit 3771	

All Participants:

(1) CLINTON OSTRUP.

(2) MATTHEW DERNIER.

Date of Interview: 2 April 2009

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 11:30+/-

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 102(b) & 35 USC 103(a)

Claims discussed:

1,18,21,35,36, 37,38,39,40,41

Prior art documents discussed:

Smith et al (6,089,228) and Ingle et al (2001/0029948)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Clinton Ostrup/
Examiner, Art Unit 3771
/Justine Yu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Mr. Dernier that he had had reviewed the amendment filed January 22, 2009 and upon a review of the prior art independent claims 1, 35, 38, and 41 would be allowable upon incorporation of the limitations of dependent claim 18 and specifying the nozzle of claims 35 and 38 as a Laval nozzle.

Mr. Dernier said he would discuss the proposed claim limitations with his client.

Later in the day, Mr. Dernier called the examiner and proposed claim modifications were discussed in order to incorporate claim 18 into independent claims 1, 35, 38 & 41.

The examiner and Mr. Dernier agreed to have the claim changes made by examiner's amendment.